

Cramer Jackson (IL)
Crenshaw Jackson-Lee
Crowley (TX)
Cubin Jefferson
Cuellar Johnson (GA)
Culberson Johnson (IL)
Cummings Johnson, E. B.
Davis (AL) Johnson, Sam
Davis (CA) Jones (NC)
Davis (IL) Jones (OH)
Davis (KY) Jordan
Davis, David Kagen
Davis, Lincoln Kanjorski
Deal (GA) Kaptur
DeFazio Keller
DeGette Kennedy
Delahunt Kildee
DeLauro Kilpatrick
Dent Kind
Diaz-Balart, L. King (IA)
Diaz-Balart, M. King (NY)
Dicks Kingston
Dingell Kirk
Doggett Klein (FL)
Donnelly Kline (MN)
Doyle Knollenberg
Drake Kucinich
Dreier Kuhl (NY)
Duncan LaHood
Edwards Lamborn
Ehlers Lampson
Ellison Langevin
Ellsworth Larsen (WA)
Emanuel Larson (CT)
Emerson Latham
Engel LaTourette
English (PA) Latta
Eshoo Lee
Etheridge Levin
Everett Lewis (CA)
Fallin Lewis (GA)
Farr Lewis (KY)
Fattah Lipinski
Feeney LoBiondo
Ferguson Loebsock
Filner Lofgren, Zoe
Forbes Lucas
Fortenberry Lungren, Daniel
Fossella E.
Foster Lynch
Foxy Mack
Frank (MA) Mahoney (FL)
Franks (AZ) Maloney (NY)
Frelinghuysen Manzullo
Gallegly Marchant
Garrett (NJ) Markey
Gerlach Marshall
Giffords Matheson
Gilchrest Matsui
Gillibrand
Gingrey McCarthy (CA)
Gohmert McCarthy (NY)
Gonzalez McCaul (TX)
Goode McCollum (MN)
Goodlatte McCotter
Gordon McCrery
Granger McDermott
Graves McGovern
Green, Al McHenry
Green, Gene McHugh
Grijalva McIntyre
Hall (NY) McKeon
Hall (TX) McMorris
Hare Rodgers
Harman McNerney
Hastings (FL) McNulty
Hastings (WA) Meek (FL)
Hayes Meeks (NY)
Heller Melancon
Hensarling Mica
Herger Michaud
Hersteth Sandlin Miller (FL)
Higgins Miller (MI)
Hill Miller (NC)
Hinchey Miller, Gary
Hinojosa Miller, George
Hirono Mitchell
Hobson Mollohan
Hodes Moore (KS)
Hoekstra Moore (WI)
Holden Moran (KS)
Holt Moran (VA)
Honda Murphy (CT)
Hoyer Murphy, Patrick
Hulshof Murphy, Tim
Hunter Murtha
Inglis (SC) Musgrave
Inslee Myrick
Israel Nadler

Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascarelli
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Perlmuter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Reynolds
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi

Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller

Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NAYS—4

Doolittle
Flake

NOT VOTING—14

Davis, Tom
Gutierrez
Hooley
Issa
Oberstar

Rangel
Renzi
Roskam
Rush
Sestak

Tancredo
Udall (CO)
Woolsey
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised that there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1730

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JACKSON of Illinois). Pursuant to House Resolution 1036 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 312.

□ 1730

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 312) revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2008, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2009, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2010 through 2013, with Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ (Acting Chairman) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, 96 minutes of debate remained on the concurrent resolution.

The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) has 49½ minutes remaining and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) has 46½ minutes remaining.

Sixty minutes remain on the subject of economic goals and policies.

Who yields time?

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Chairman, I yield 17 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD).

Mr. BOYD of Florida. Madam Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman, my friend, Chairman SPRATT, for yielding the time.

I rise today to speak in support of the budget resolution that Chairman SPRATT and his committee have crafted and brought to the House floor. Madam Chairman, in 2001, January of 2001, when this Republican administration came into office, and since that time, the 47-strong Blue Dog Coalition, fiscally conservative Blue Dog Coalition, has been sounding the alarm about the terrible financial management of our country's resources and financial resources, and we have been calling for fiscal sanity in terms of how we perform our duties as a government and how we pay for those duties.

Unfortunately, for the first 6 years of this administration, those calls fell on deaf ears of this Republican administration and in the Republican Congress. Since last January, a year ago, there has been a change in course in how this country, this government, this Congress does its business as it relates to managing the fiscal resources that our citizens here in the United States of America give to us to perform our community functions and our government functions.

And so we have before us today a budget resolution which meets the guiding principles that the Blue Dogs have laid out over the last 2 years in how we should manage ourselves fiscally.

And so I am extremely delighted to be here today to support the budget resolution that Chairman SPRATT brings and tell you that those guiding principles of having a balanced budget by 2012, an AMT fix that's paid for, abide by PAYGO rules, which is a very important tool, providing for the resources for the defense of our country. As a matter of fact, we used the President's defense number. All of those principles have been met in this budget, and I'm delighted to support that budget.

At this time, I would like to recognize the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER) to address the budget resolution.

Mr. TANNER. Madam Chairman, we have seen, as Mr. BOYD pointed out, an unprecedented amount of borrowing take place since 2001. No political leadership in this country has borrowed as much money as quickly as we have seen over the last 80 months or so. That's just part of the story. Let me tell you the other part of the story.

This administration has borrowed more money from foreign sources than all 42 administrations before it put together. And apparently, some here on the floor want to keep doing what we've been doing.

This budget resolution is like an aircraft carrier. It takes seven miles to turn an aircraft carrier. This starts the turn back toward some degree of fiscal sanity. Let me tell you what the consequences of what we have witnessed are with this foreign borrowing.

Today, because of these practices, we are borrowing. Remember, now, we are in war in Iraq and Afghanistan. We are borrowing from foreign sources \$505 million a day, \$21 million an hour, which means we've borrowed probably close to \$80 million since we started this debate, \$351,000 a minute, \$5,852 a second, for a total a year of \$182 billion a year that everybody around the world is letting us have so that we can maintain, as some would suggest, our standard of living.

All of you know that when you downgrade your financial base to the extent that we have and that we are continuing to do unless we begin to change courses, as this budget does, this country is going to wind up in the trash bin of history. No country can continue to do this. You would be interested to know that we owe China almost half a billion dollars. We owe Mexico \$35 billion. We owe Taiwan \$38 billion. Maybe Taiwan will give us a loan so we can defend them against China if that ever occurs. We owe Switzerland \$39 billion, Japan over a half a trillion, the UK, Brazil, Caribbean Banking. We owe Luxembourg \$70 billion, and it's going up every day to the tune of \$500 million a year.

This budget starts to turn back toward some degree of fiscal sanity. Everybody in this country knows we can't continue to do what these people want to continue to do without bankrupting ourselves and our children.

Mr. BOYD of Florida. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee. He's been a leader on this issue for a long time and the leader of the Blue Dogs.

And at this time, I would like to recognize another one of our leaders from Arkansas (Mr. ROSS).

Mr. ROSS. Madam Chairman, earlier today my Blue Dog colleagues and I stood together to offer our official endorsement of Chairman SPRATT's budget because it is clear that we share the common goal of eliminating wasteful government spending, adhering to strict PAYGO principles, and finally addressing the long-term fiscal challenges facing this country. Not only does this budget resolution begin to address our long-term fiscal challenges, it also includes measures that crack down on wasteful government spending so that no tax dollar is wasted.

This budget continues to take steps to reverse the reckless fiscal policies of the past 7 years of Republican rule by incorporating strict PAYGO rules. It does this in two ways: First, it provides for fiscally responsible tax relief for 23 million middle-income Americans by including a fully offset fix to the alternative minimum tax; second, Chairman SPRATT's budget resolution includes a commitment to the extension of the same statutory PAYGO requirements which proved instrumental in turning the large deficits of the early 1990s under a Republican into record-budget surpluses under a Democrat for the first time in over 40 years.

The Blue Dogs are committed to addressing the serious long-term fiscal challenges facing the United States, and we should confront these challenges earlier rather than later so that we do not pass the burden of unmanageable debt on to our children and grandchildren.

This administration, this Republican administration, has borrowed more money from foreigners in the past 7 years than the previous 42 Presidents combined. It is time to restore common sense and fiscal discipline and accountability to our government. That's what this budget resolution does, and I'm pleased to stand and speak in support of it.

Mr. BOYD of Florida. Madam Chairman, it's my privilege to recognize at this time one of what we call our "Blue Puppies," the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MAHONEY).

Mr. MAHONEY of Florida. Madam Chairman, I rise today to enter into this colloquy with Mr. BOYD to express my support for the House budget resolution for fiscal year 2009. A budget is a reflection of our national priorities. For far too long, the administration's priorities have been misplaced. In fact, the budget submitted by the President earlier this year makes cuts to Medicaid, Medicare, and the environment. In addition, it taxes our veterans by requiring them to pay new fees for health care.

As a result of this administration's misplaced priorities, the \$5.6 trillion projected 10-year surplus that they have inherited has been squandered. As a result, our children and grandchildren are confronted with the challenge of paying back a \$9.3 trillion debt.

This budget before us today, however, is a good budget for Florida and the Nation. The House budget protects our homeland by rejecting the President's cuts to first responder programs, reinstates funding for the COPS program, and that will put 247 more police on the street in Florida. This budget helps Florida's kids. It provides substantially more money for schools and education than the President's budget. It will allow our schools to hire the highly skilled teachers that over 25,000 Florida children need desperately to help them grow up and compete in the global economy. It rejects the President's irresponsible new fees that he wants to put on the backs of our veterans. It increases health care funding to allow our Veterans Administration to treat the 5.8 million more patients, including 333,000 from the Iraq and Afghanistan wars.

I support this budget because it is fiscally responsible, it balances the budget by 2012, and it adheres to all of the PAYGO rules. Finally, I support this budget because it protects the most vulnerable among us: our Nation's seniors. Specifically, the budget resolution improves support of housing for the elderly.

I would like to thank Chairman SPRATT for working with me to ensure

that the Section 202 Housing for the Elderly program is adequately funded. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. BOYD of Florida. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MAHONEY). He's been a great leader, and he's been successful before he got here, and he's going to be a successful Member of Congress.

I will call at this time on really the fiscal conscience of this House of Representatives, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER).

Mr. COOPER. Madam Chairman, I'm happy to support this budget. One of the reasons is the extraordinary leadership of the chairman of the House Budget Committee, JOHN SPRATT from South Carolina. A true gentleman, a man of wisdom, he has done the difficult work of pulling a very diverse caucus together, and we appreciate his listening to Blue Dog concerns.

We are proud of our role as Blue Dogs as having pulled the Democratic Caucus towards the middle. That's a good thing and help make the Democratic Party the party of fiscal responsibility in America.

People who know me know that I am not a very partisan person. I admire greatly the ranking member, Mr. RYAN. I think he has done a great job in his conference of pulling the many diverse elements together. It is a tough job. My primary concern is actually the long-term, reforming entitlement programs. Sadly, there's very little of that in either of the budgets. There needs to be a lot more.

I'm championing a bill right now called H.R. 3654, the Cooper-Wolf bill, and I appreciate very much Chairman SPRATT allowing us to have hearings on that measure. I'm hoping those hearings will allow this Congress to focus attention on the need to have an expert bipartisan commission that will advise the new President, because problems of this dimension will take Presidential leadership to help work on making sure that Medicare and Social Security and Medicaid are solvent for the next generation.

So I'm excited about the prospect of those hearings. I think it is a real opportunity for this Congress to take a long-term view and to make sure that the next President is successful in addressing these problems. My friend from Wisconsin knows the dimension of these things. These are not easily tackled, but they can and must be addressed in a prompt fashion.

So I think that slowly but surely we are turning the ship of state here in the right direction. The statistics that my colleague from Tennessee mentioned about President George W. Bush having borrowed more money from foreign nations than every previous President in American history, that's an amazing thing. That's George Washington through Bill Clinton. To have borrowed more money from foreigners, all of them put together, is truly an astonishing fact.

□ 1745

We've got to change the course of this Nation. The American people are demanding change. I'm hoping that we'll get change in this election. And this budget is one way to start demonstrating that change.

I thank my friend from Florida for yielding and for his important work in leading the Blue Dog Coalition in this Congress.

Mr. BOYD of Florida. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee.

May I inquire of the Chair how much time we have left.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida has 3½ minutes left.

Mr. BOYD of Florida. Let me simply close, Madam Chairman, by saying that there is always a lot of rhetoric and accusations flying around at budget time in the House of Representatives, and you will hear much talk about this budget raising taxes. Let me tell you, this budget does not raise taxes. The independent, nonpartisan groups outside of this body say that. Listen to them. They certainly would come at this in an objective manner.

What this budget does do is it sticks to the principles that the Blue Dogs have laid out. It adheres strictly to the PAYGO principle, a principle that helped us get the Federal Government budget back in balance in the nineties that this Congress in 2002 allowed to expire, the PAYGO principle.

This budget also provides for a fully offset AMT fix, fully offset. What does that mean? It's paid for. You either find spending cuts or other revenue sources to do it.

This budget also provides for adequate defense funding. One of the things that we said is let's not have the debate in this budget about the war. We know what the policy is now of this administration; let's provide the funds for our troops overseas and not have that debate here. This budget does that.

And most importantly, Madam Chairman, it provides a glide path for balance, gets this Nation's fiscal issues back into balance by 2012.

If I could, Madam Chairman, the gentlelady from South Dakota (Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN) has just arrived and I would like to yield to her.

Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN. I thank the gentleman. And I thank Chairman SPRATT and Mr. BOYD for their leadership on the Budget Committee in fashioning a budget resolution for fiscal year 2009 that is putting our fiscal condition on a course toward far better health than we've seen in the first 6 years of the Bush administration and the continued proposals that we've seen from the administration in the substantial cuts, but also the imbalance that we've been experiencing and adding to the national debt.

I am proud, as a member of the Blue Dog Coalition, to support this resolution because of so many of the core principles of our organization and fis-

cal responsibility that Mr. BOYD and Mr. COOPER and others have identified here in our endorsement, our strong and enthusiastic endorsement of this budget resolution that will bring us to balance by 2012, that will include in reconciliation instructions in light of what happened to us last year, the full offsets to pay for alternative minimum tax relief for middle-class families across the country, and that also maintains the principle of PAYGO, but also recognizes the importance of a strong national defense in accepting the President's number, as well as increasing the amount of money we are spending on veterans health care, because ongoing costs of national security include taking care of our Nation's fighting men and women.

I applaud Chairman SPRATT for his great work and encourage my colleagues to support this important budget resolution.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes, 2 minutes to say, "wow." We just heard from the sort of self-proclaimed fiscal conservative wing of the Democratic Party talking about, while it's wrong to increase debt, it's bad to send this to future generations, and then to have all of them come here and say how great it is that they're spending so much more money on all these new programs in their budget.

We've also heard another claim, that there are no tax increases in this budget. Well, I've got the budget right here. The budget is a series of numbers, and the numbers are crystal clear. The numbers raise taxes.

We heard from two gentlemen from Florida, two gentlemen from Tennessee and the gentlelady from South Dakota. The average annual tax increase on the average taxpayer in Arkansas is \$2,462 per year. The average tax increase for the taxpayer under this budget in Florida is \$3,040. The average annual tax increase for the average taxpayer in South Dakota is \$2,596. And the average tax increase for the average taxpayer in Tennessee is \$2,611.

Now there is this thing at the end of this budget resolution in section 5, and it's a policy title. And it says, basically, we don't want to raise these taxes, we hope not to do it, but this resolution, Madam Chairman, is worth no more than the paper it's printed on. It's simply a sense of the Congress resolution. It's the legislative equivalent of passing a bill and saying, "Have a nice day."

This budget unequivocally, extremely clearly, relies on, depends on the largest tax increase in American history. Repealing the marriage tax penalty relief, raising income tax rates across the board, cutting in half the marriage tax penalty, bringing back the death tax in full force, raising the dividends in the capital gains tax. Real taxpayers paying really high taxes, about \$3,000 on average: \$2,400 in Arkansas, \$3,000 in Florida, \$2,600 in South Dakota, \$2,600 in Tennessee. That's real money.

With that, Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana, the ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. MCCRERY.

Mr. MCCRERY. Madam Chairman, the speakers from the majority side for the last 15 minutes or so are among the Members of the House that I have the most respect for, Mr. COOPER, Mr. TANNER, Mr. BOYD. I have watched them over the last few years show courage when it comes to fiscal discipline, when it comes to entitlement reform and suggesting a need for entitlement reform. So it was with some surprise that I heard them today endorse the majority's budget as crafted by the majority on the Budget Committee.

And the reason I say I was somewhat surprised is that I believe those gentlemen over the years have talked about the need to constrain spending at the Federal level, to restrain spending. That's the whole point of talking about entitlement reform. They know that the entitlement programs, Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, are unsustainable as currently structured. And with some courage, they have talked over the last few years about the need to tackle those problems and get this spending under control.

And so when my friend, Mr. TANNER, talked about turning this ship, and it takes so many miles and so long to turn a ship and this budget starts the turn and that's a great thing, well, the minority budget does the same thing. It starts to turn that ship in the right direction, also, toward a balanced budget. The difference is the majority's budget turns that ship with the energy source of higher taxes, whereas our ship, the minority ship, is being turned with the energy source of restrained spending.

So I hope, Madam Chairman, that my good friends, for whom I have much respect, will see the light before the vote comes and join us in supporting a budget that does what they want to do, that gets the ship of state turned in the right direction, but does it through what they have advocated very soundly over the last few years, which is spending restraint, not increases in taxes.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chairman, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER).

Mr. HERGER. Madam Chairman, we are now in year two of the Democrat majority. For the second year in a row they're proposing a budget that calls for the largest tax increase in American history, \$683 billion significantly more than last year's budget. For our constituents, this means eliminating the lower marginal tax rates, a new penalty on marriage, a lower child tax credit, and new taxes on investment and retirement savings.

In California, taxpayers can look forward to an additional \$3,331 in taxes. Meanwhile, anticipating a tax hike, our Nation's employers would think twice before hiring that next worker or

investing in new infrastructure. Madam Chairman, we need permanent tax relief, not higher taxes. What's more, this Democrat budget fails to address the long-term solvency of Social Security and Medicare.

Every year we do nothing, as prescribed in the budget before us, our future debt goes up by another \$2 trillion. Without reform, our three largest entitlement programs will keep growing until they crowd out everything else in the Federal budget, from national defense to transportation, to assistance for the poor. Ignoring the problem will not make it go away.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this budget and support our more responsible Republican alternative.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chairman, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to a senior member of the Ways and Means Committee, the ranking member of the Health Subcommittee, Mr. CAMP from Michigan.

Mr. CAMP of Michigan. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Under the budget resolution put forth by the majority, every American should be aware that their wallets are going to get a lot lighter. As the economy softens and we lose jobs, the Democrat budget resolution prescribes an overpowering combination of tax hikes and wasteful spending that will have our economy reeling.

The one positive thing I will say about this budget resolution is that it provides Americans with an excellent glimpse into the future under a Democrat majority; more spending, more taxes, and more of Washington telling you what to do.

The majority has written a budget blueprint that imposes a massive, unheard-of \$3.9 trillion tax hike that will cause the average American household to pay \$3,000 extra in Federal taxes next year. Washington doesn't need this money. Washington doesn't need to spend an extra \$3.9 trillion of the American people's money on redundant wasteful government programs.

The bureaucracy is far from being starved of revenue. Especially under these economic circumstances, it is wrong for this House, for this Congress, for this government to raise taxes.

Under the Democrats' budget resolution Washington spending will increase because 44 million children will no longer qualify for the \$1,000 child tax credit. It will increase because American couples will be hit by the marriage penalty.

Don't believe these taxes will just be on the rich. Under this budget, low-income Americans will be forced into a higher tax bracket. Worse yet, Federal spending will increase because Americans will no longer be able to pass on a lifetime of dedication, devotion and hard work to the next generation. Instead, Uncle Sam will reap a whopping 55 percent death tax. Taxing the living isn't enough for the Democrats; under this budget resolution, they even go after the dearly departed.

We should be cutting spending to balance our budget, not raising taxes. With rising food prices, energy costs, health care spending and other everyday bills going up, this is no time for Congress to ask Americans to pay more and make do with less.

I urge my colleagues to reject this massive tax hike and vote "no" on the budget resolution.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN).

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin, who is doing a wonderful job presenting this today on the budget.

Mr. Chairman, it was about this time last year that we came to the House floor, I was a brand new freshman, and I have to say my jaw dropped when I looked at the budget proposal. Being a mom of five kids, 23 foster kids, just an average family, we know what it is to balance a budget just in our own home. And I saw the Democrats lay out their budget proposal which was the largest tax increase in American history.

And here we are, it's *deja vu* all over again because we see the Democrats are now having a tax increase that's even higher than last year, \$683 billion. It's hard to count that high, Mr. Chairman, \$683 billion in tax increases, hitting Americans at the most inauspicious time when we're in an uncertain economy, when families clearly across the Nation are paying more for health care, for education, certainly for gas, certainly for groceries.

□ 1800

And in Minnesota in particular, this means an average individual tax increase of \$3,088.

Yes, Minnesotans, this means an average tax increase for you of \$3,088. I know you have many other places where you could use \$3,088.

And it's an average loss in income for people in my district, Mr. Chairman, of \$1,609.

Unfortunately, it gets worse. It means over 2,665 fewer jobs for people in Minnesota, \$292 million less in our local economy.

Those are real people's lives that are impacted by those figures. They aren't just numbers. They're real people's lives. And it's pain and it's suffering that this Congress does not have to deliver to normal average American taxpayers. In total, this budget increases our Federal tax burden, unbelievably, from 18 percent of GDP to over 20 percent of GDP in 2013.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I thank the gentlewoman for her comments.

At this time, Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of fiscal responsibility, and, therefore, conscience demands that I

rise in opposition to the budget of the liberal Democratic majority in Congress.

The American people deserve to know. We have a \$9.3 trillion national debt. They also deserve to know that there are some \$53 trillion in unfunded obligations that this government has committed to in Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid that our children and grandchildren will have to find some way to resolve and to fund. Frankly, if this government was a business back in Indiana, we'd have to file bankruptcy.

Now, tomorrow Republicans will offer a budget to deal with this fiscal crisis at the national level that's based on spending restraint, entitlement reform. It balances the Federal budget without taxes and without earmarks.

But the answer from the Democrat majority in Congress: The largest budget in American history, \$3.1 trillion. The largest 1-year increase in public debt in American history, some \$646 billion. More earmarks, higher taxes, and nothing to reform the entitlement spending that threatens the vitality of our economy and the very future of our children and grandchildren.

In 2006, the American people voted for change in Washington, D.C., but they weren't referring to what would be left in their pockets after the Democrats took control. We must balance the Federal budget with fiscal discipline and reform, not with more spending and more taxes. We must reject the policies of the new liberal Democrat majority in Congress and reject this budget.

I urge my colleagues to vote for fiscal discipline and reform and join me in voting against the budget priorities of the liberal Democrat majority in Congress.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. At this time, Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished ranking member of the Agriculture Committee, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the ranking member for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to this bloated budget resolution.

Facing a slowing economy and an increased cost of living, Americans have to tighten their belts and carefully budget their hard-earned money. It's time the Federal Government did the same.

Instead, the budget proposed by the majority exceeds the President's spending levels by \$276 billion over 5 years. This budget increases discretionary spending and fails to touch entitlement reform.

To pay for the massive spending increases, the bill passes the cost on to lower and middle class American taxpayers. This budget resolution calls for the largest tax increase in American history, \$683 billion over the next 5 years, which means 116 million taxpayers will face an average tax hike of more than \$1,800. Worst of all, it raises the debt by \$646 billion.

Mr. Chairman, Washington has a spending problem, not a revenue problem. This budget makes no attempt to rein in wasteful government spending or balance our Federal budget. I believe it should be the highest priority in this House to balance the budget, which is why, on the first day of this Congress, I introduced House Joint Resolution 1, a constitutional amendment to require that the Federal budget be balanced, with 160 bipartisan co-sponsors.

When families across the country are preparing their budget, they know that they can't spend more than they take in. It's a simple concept but one that Congress has not adhered to for far too long. We must balance the budget and cut the national debt, not by raising taxes but by being good stewards of taxpayer money.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me in rejecting this fiscally irresponsible budget and rein in wasteful spending.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 17 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I'd first like to begin by sincerely congratulating the chairman of the committee and the ranking member from Wisconsin for, I think, a very thoughtful and substantive approach to a very serious set of problems. I think that the tone and quality of the debate on the House floor this afternoon has served the country well and has served the institution well, and it is entirely owing to the leadership of the chairman and ranking member and the men and women who serve the Members' committee so well, and I appreciate that.

I strongly support the gentleman from South Carolina's (Mr. SPRATT) budget. I think it's the right thing for the country based upon an analysis of facts, choices, and consequences. The most important factual reason that the gentleman from South Carolina's (Mr. SPRATT) budget benefits and strengthens families in our country is it operates on the principle that American families operate under, which is you can't live on borrowed money forever. You can't run your credit card up forever and hope that you win the lottery someday to get yourself out of that mess. The gentleman from South Carolina's (Mr. SPRATT) budget, just as American families do across this country, recognizes the reality that you have to make choices.

Now, the other fact that I think is very important that Members realize is that this budget does not have a tax increase for anyone this year or anyone next year or anyone last year. One of our friends on the other side, Mr. Chairman, said that this was *deja vu*, this budget. She was exactly right because most of us were here almost exactly a year ago and heard a ritualistic

incantation from the minority side that this was the largest tax increase in American history, the largest tax increase in the history of the world, the largest tax increase in the history of the universe, the largest tax increase in whatever's larger than the universe.

Mr. Chairman, I'd just invite the people of this country to evaluate the validity of that claim. When they sit down and fill out their tax return this year, they should ask themselves the question, did my income tax rates go up? No, they didn't. Did the capital gains tax rates go up? No, they didn't. Did the excise taxes go up? No, they didn't. And the same answer would be true for this year and the year after that.

Now, I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that people listen to this debate and they say, how can this be that the Democrats get up and say there are no tax increases in this budget and the Republicans get up and say it's the largest tax increase in the history of civilization or whatever the latest version of it is? Here's the answer:

In 2010 the tax cuts enacted earlier in this decade expire, and the Congress will have to make a choice. Until then, there is no tax raised on anyone for anything. When that day occurs, this budget contemplates that we will do what families across the country do and make an intelligent decision. If the economy bounces back and grows, there's a very good chance there will be plenty of revenue to renew all of those tax cuts. If it doesn't, then the Congress has the choice of reducing spending in given areas to finance tax cuts for all or some of the people who would be affected.

But what we will not do is what the erstwhile majority elevated to an art form during its reign, which is to borrow the money to pay the bills. We won't indebt the children of this country to the People's Republic of China and our other creditors because we don't have the discipline to make a decision here.

There's a big choice. Our budget believes that the economy grows and American families prosper by stopping the practice of borrowing money to run the government, by investing in the education and health care and development of our people, and by expanding economic opportunity. We believe that works.

The other side, with great sincerity, believes that massive tax breaks for the wealthiest people will trickle down to the rest of us and that will work.

This is the big choice we have to make, but there is a record for this choice. We do not have to make this choice in the empty vacuum of political theory. You see, because we tried their way for 6 years when they had control of both Chambers and the White House, and our strategy of stopping the practice of borrowing money, investing in people, expanding economic opportunity is what we tried for most of the 1990s, and there's a record.

They created some jobs through their strategy. But for every one job they created, we created five. There was some economic growth under their strategy, but for every dollar of economic growth they created or facilitated, we created a dollar and a half.

What was the impact of their strategy on the American families that this budget supports? Well, over a 6-year period, the purchasing power of a typical middle class American family shrunk by \$1,100. During the years in which our strategy was the policy of this country, the purchasing power of a middle class family increased by \$6,000.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield briefly to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Isn't it the case that the Republicans controlled Congress from 1995 on?

Mr. ANDREWS. Yes.

Reclaiming my time, it's also the case that every single Republican there in 1993 voted against the plan that put that into effect and, therefore, they have no ownership.

So I would say the record is very, very clear, that I think our friend from Wisconsin and his fellow colleagues on the committee are very well intentioned about the policy they followed to help American families. I just think they're wrong, and I think the record shows that they're wrong.

Now, what are some of the consequences in this budget between their way and our way? Well, one of them is the issue of middle class tax cuts. Now, they are going to say that all these middle class taxes are going to go up.

Here's the reality: The budget contains what we call a reserve fund for the purpose of financing middle class tax cuts. And, again, when we reach that point, we will make a decision as to how best to preserve those, either based upon growth in the economy, which we certainly hope will occur, in offsets in spending, which we are prepared to make, or in other sources of revenue which we have brought to this floor before.

□ 1815

Look at the issue of children's health care. Last year, we attempted to provide health insurance for 5 million additional children. These are the children of people that work in convenience stores, gas stations and retail stores. These are very hardworking people who are struggling to get ahead. And there is a program that has worked very well since 1997 to help those families and their children. Now, we wanted to expand that coverage to 5 million more children, and we paid for it. A great number of Members on their side voted for this, and a great number of Members of the other body on their side voted for this, but not quite enough, because we ran into a Presidential veto, and we couldn't quite override it here.

Our budget will do the same thing. It will say let's find health insurance for

5 million more children who do not have it, and let's pay for it. Let's not pay for it by borrowed money.

For those who are trying to live by collecting child support enforcement, there are more resources for it. For those women who are pregnant or have small children and want to promote their well-being, there is more money for it. For Americans struggling to deal with getting by and paying the grocery bills on food stamps, there is more resources for this. Public health issues, whether it is the spread of disease or the prevention of disease, there is more resources for this, as well.

This budget proceeds on the powerful principle on which American families proceed. Don't try to survive on borrowed money forever. It puts us in position to make difficult and sometimes unpopular choices. It does not raise taxes on anyone in the fiscal year that is in front of us, and it makes investments in the strategy for economic growth that has worked in the past and we believe will work again.

I know that the gentlelady from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS) who is new to the institution, but in no way new to serving her constituents, has a special concern about block grants. I would like to encourage her to engage in a colloquy at this time.

Ms. TSONGAS. I would like to thank the gentleman from New Jersey.

Like my colleagues, I was disappointed that the President's budget made such a poor investment in the health of our Nation's cities and communities at a time when strong action is necessary to stave off economic ruin for many hardworking Americans. Our cities are our Nation's economic engines, providing vital infrastructure, the foundation for an educated workforce, and for the health of our communities.

For any of us who represents a city of any size, we know what a challenge it is, and yet how important it is that the Federal Government be a strategic partner with them. When I asked leaders in the cities of my district how the Federal Government could best help, the answer was unhesitating and unequivocal: Community Development Block Grant funding. CDBG funding has improved the quality of life in the cities of the Merrimack Valley in my district and in thousands of other cities across the country by helping to improve parks, add green space, and create affordable housing.

In Lowell, CDBG funds were used to reclaim a contaminated site creating the potential to attract new companies to employ city residents. And they are not alone in putting these funds to such good use. Most recently, the City of Lawrence suffered a devastating fire which destroyed businesses and homes downtown. CDBG funding has been critical for razing and rebuilding these destroyed properties.

If CDBG funding is not adequately in place, communities like this, faced with disaster, would have few alter-

natives to help finance their recovery effort, not to mention the loss of support for vital housing and community and economic development activities that States and local governments have come to rely on.

I would like to confirm with the gentleman from New Jersey that the budget resolution before us today thankfully rejects the President's cuts to the grant programs that have proven so critical to helping our communities and provide additional funding for CDBG and other economic development and affordable housing priorities.

I would also like to confirm that the budget before us today rejects the President's proposal to eliminate the Social Services Block Grant. Cities in my district rely on social service and community service grants to carry out programs ranging from parenting classes and consumer and tax counseling to child enrichment and adult literacy classes. Without these funds, critical elements of our social safety net will be lost exactly when American families need them most.

I thank the gentleman for engaging in a colloquy and for presenting us with a budget that makes both a moral statement about our priorities and a reality-driven investment in the continued growth and vitality of our communities.

Mr. SPRATT. I can assure the gentlelady that the programs that are of concern to her from the Community Development Block Grant, the Social Services Block Grant and the Community Services Block Grant are all accommodated in this budget resolution, and we definitely oppose certainly the repeal of the Social Services Block Grant.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin) having assumed the chair, Mr. ALTMIRE, Acting Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 312) revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2008, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2009, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2010 through 2013, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 3773, FISA AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2008

Mr. WELCH of Vermont, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110-549) on the resolution (H. Res. 1041) providing for the consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 3773) to amend

the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to establish a procedure for authorizing certain acquisitions of foreign intelligence, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1036 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 312.

□ 1822

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 312) revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2008, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2009, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2010 through 2013, with Mr. ALTMIRE (Acting Chairman) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) had 23 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) had 32½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SPRATT. Could the Chair please inform us of the time allotted to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), how much remains available.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SPRATT. I yield to the gentleman the balance of his time.

Mr. ANDREWS. At this time I am pleased to yield to the gentlewoman who has been a leader on child support efforts for purpose of a colloquy, the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey.

The Democratic budget resolution is a lifeline to families during this economic downturn. One aspect of the chairman's mark before us calls on Congress to restore the harmful cuts made to the Child Support Enforcement program, and as a result of the only bipartisan amendment brought forth by the ranking member and me, it restores the ability of States to pass along every cent of child support collected to families rather than nickeling and diming them out of this child support to make repayments to government bureaucracies.

Since we have demanded that parents move off welfare and take financial responsibility for their families, child